

THE REPUBLIC.

WASHINGTON:

MONDAY MORNING, SEPT. 10, 1849.

The President's Return.

General TAYLOR returned to the city, on the morning of the 8th instant, after an absence of four weeks. His tour was arrested before he had visited a half of the country he originally designed to traverse, by a malady which, at one time, assumed a most threatening phase. At Harrisburg and Carlisle, Pennsylvania, he was attacked by what was considered premonitions of cholera, but which turned out to be the incipient stages of a malady which has proved too fatal to many of our officers who most distinguished themselves in the Florida and Mexican wars. The first symptoms of disease were readily subdued, and the President resumed his tour; not, however, without serious misgivings, on the part of many of his friends, as to his ability to complete it, as he had purposed on leaving the capital. The incidents of his progress through western Pennsylvania have been already published throughout the country; suffice it to say, at this time, that his reception everywhere, by the people, was such as might well recompense him for the perils and hardships he had undergone in serving his country, and the violence which he has encountered from politicians, in his determination to devote his administration to the cause of peace, progress, and justice—peace, without the sacrifice of honor; progress, without radicalism; and justice, tempered by sympathy with the wants and requirements of the age.

At Erie, Pennsylvania, his tour was brought to a sudden termination by a recurrence of his attack with distressing and ominous symptoms. He was stricken down by diarrhoea, accompanied by a raging fever. At one time his physicians, for two days, apprehended a fatal termination of his illness. By careful tending and skilful treatment he was at length relieved, but in such a state of physical exhaustion as to render great exertion or fatigue of any kind unsafe. He left Erie as soon as he was able to travel, direct for the Falls of Niagara, not stopping at Buffalo, or any other intervening point. At Niagara he hoped to regain sufficient strength to justify the resumption of his tour; but four hours' sojourn there was sufficient to confirm his medical advisers in the opinion that his disease had been of so serious a nature as to preclude the idea of recovering physical vigor, in any reasonable length of time, to go through fatigues and excitements such as he had encountered before his illness, and such as they had reason to know awaited a further prosecution of his visit. This circumstance, and the reception of despatches which made his presence at Washington desirable, induced the President to hasten his return home, which he did by the easiest and most expeditious conveyances.

He reached Washington, as we before said, on the morning of the 8th instant, greatly reduced in strength and flesh, but we are happy to inform our readers, without disease, and where repose and the influences of domestic life will soon, we trust, repair his health.

The several attacks which the President encountered may be attributed to the fatigue of public receptions, and the excitement which are incident upon a continuous mingling with large masses of people. It was the desire of General TAYLOR to pass through the country with as little display as possible. It was more his object to see his fellow-citizens at their homes, in their shops, and in their manufactories, upon their farmsteads, and in their cities, than to be seen by them. His object he accomplished, as far as his affectionate interest would permit him to do so. Whatever of ceremonial attended his reception anywhere was the arrangement of others, designed for the most part for convenience sake. Wherever the people assembled to greet him in thousands and tens of thousands, it was a spontaneous homage to one of themselves, who had won their gratitude by services which added to the renown of his country, whilst they secured his own. Such was the enthusiasm of the people, that no municipal arrangements could restrain them, and they pressed to see him until they were, as the President remarked, nigh killing him with kindness. As long as he was able to endure it, this informal and republican mode of social intercourse was more agreeable to General TAYLOR than the most pompous and brilliant pageant. He left home to see them, to know them, that he might better serve them. They met him as their President, as their servant, and their friend.

Although it was known that his tour was broken up on account of his health, the President, on his return to Washington, was met at every town and stopping-place, between the Falls of Niagara and this city, by large concourses of people, who greeted him with their welcome and cheered him with their unaffected sympathy. At many places their enthusiasm wellnigh overcame the forbearance which his health exacted, and it was with difficulty that they were restrained from demonstrations and proceedings which might have perilled his safety. His own prudence, too, was taxed in repressing a desire to accommodate himself to the wishes of his countrymen. Now that he has arrived home, and in safety, the gratification he feels in recurring to the thrilling scenes through which he has passed is qualified by regret that he should have been compelled, by untoward and un-

avoidable circumstances, to disappoint any portion of them.

He is now at home, and in a little while the sufferings he has endured during his tour will be forgotten; whilst the recollection of the enthusiasm, the consideration, and the sympathy which were shown him by the people, will remain. For his country he has suffered and achieved much; for his countrymen and their good he is ready to endure more.

General Taylor and the Elections.

The Opposition journals have appealed to the results of the recent elections as exhibiting a decrease in the popularity of President TAYLOR. Some of them allege that he has lost all his strength with the masses, and that there are thousands on thousands of the "humbugged" voters who are returning to their first love, very indignant at having been betrayed into voting for General TAYLOR, by his promise to be a President of the people. Only one of these "humbugged" gentlemen has yet been produced—a Mr. LIPPARD, of Philadelphia. The letter of this person furnished the Opposition with texts, paragraphs, and leading articles for some two months. They had a bite at one more of the same sort, a Dr. BLACKBURN, of Georgia; but the doctor would not stand fire, and that case has been abandoned. We believe that Mr. LIPPARD, as matters stand, is the only "humbugged" Democrat who has made his appearance publicly since the 4th of March: so insignificant has been the effect of the mad outcry of the Opposition journals; or so little account have been the vile fabrications and the insane denunciations of the Union and its kindred spirits.

The elections that have taken place demonstrate one fact very conclusively, which is, that if the Administration has lost any thing, it has been by misplaced clemency, and not by carrying out the "change of men" which General TAYLOR declared to be necessary to "arrest the downward tendency of our affairs." We have lost in Virginia. We have lost in Iowa. Our friends say that our loss in those States has been owing to the fact that the Federal patronage has been suffered to remain, to a great extent, in the hands of our adversaries. The navy agent at Norfolk wields a large share of the Federal patronage in Virginia. The surveyor general of Iowa wields the largest share of Federal patronage in that State. The Whigs could not counteract the power and influence which these circumstances gave the Locofocos. It seemed poor encouragement to Whig exertion, to keep in the hands of our adversaries the means of perpetuating their power.

But how is it in other States? We find in the New York Tribune a tabular view of the results of the late elections in those contested Congressional districts from which we have complete returns, compared with the vote of General TAYLOR in the same districts in the Presidential election:

1848. Gen. Taylor's vote. Whig Cong. vote, '48.

Rhode Island, 2d district. 2,328 2,328

Alabama, 5th district. 21,932 22,116

N. Carolina, 6th do. 30,075 29,010

Indiana, complete. 69,997 70,504

Total, of these..... 124,315 124,432

Whig Congress vote over Taylor's, 137.

It appears from this table that there exists an actual Whig gain in those districts since the election of last year. So far is it from being true that President TAYLOR is impaired in his popularity by the libels that have been leveled at him, and the unmeasured, shameless vituperation of which he has been the subject—he has actually gained strength. A larger Whig vote has been polled in 1849 than was polled in 1848 in the contested districts; and this, notwithstanding the loss which every dominant party must sustain in the early stages of its career, from the inevitable disappointments and heart-burnings which spring from the distribution of offices. These causes have operated to some extent to our injury in Tennessee and in Kentucky, though in the latter State we suffered chiefly from the introduction of local topics into the canvass, which operated to the disadvantage of the Whigs. The Congressional election in Connecticut took place at a time when there was a suspension of opinion as to the policy of administration, and an unquiet sentiment in the Whig mind arising from a supposed delay and reluctance in the Cabinet in adopting measures indispensable for the maintenance of Whig ascendancy. We believe that if the election in Connecticut had taken place at the same time with that in Vermont and that in Rhode Island, the Whigs would have triumphed over the combined forces of the Free-Soilers and Democrats.

The American Consul at Paris.

It is a matter of notoriety that the American consul at Paris has recently been the theme of general discussion in the newspapers. We have already noticed the subject, and should not now return to it, but from what we deem a sense of duty. In the *Journal of Commerce* of Friday last, we see it formally announced that Mr. WALSH is the author of the Paris letters which have lately appeared in the columns of that paper, and which have excited so general an expression of disgust and indignation throughout the country, on account of their hostility to the cause of human liberty for which thousands are now laying down their lives in Europe. It is true that the statement of the *Journal* affords us no new information, for it was before generally understood that Mr. WALSH was the author of the letters in question. But inasmuch as the above announcement is thus formally given, and that, too, in connexion with a defence of Mr. WALSH, we feel bound to give the subject deliberate consideration.

The defence offered by the *Journal* in behalf of the consul is comprised in a few pithy sentences. "He does not write in his public capacity, but as a private individual." Quoting the words of another, the *Journal* tells us—"Mr. Walsh is a consul only, and is responsible to the Government for his acts, and not his opinions!"

We have heard it said that words were sometimes deeds; and if history be true, writings are acts, and often of fatal efficacy. In his recent letters, as we shall presently show, Mr. WALSH takes part against Hungary, and in favor of Russia, in the fearful conflict which is now waging, if, indeed, it has not already closed in the triumph of despotism. Now, is not this action? Does it not operate to nerve the arm of tyranny, and to dishearten the already bleeding and desponding champions of liberty? And is not the effect increased by the notorious fact that he who writes is an officer of the United States? He speaks, therefore, with authority, derived from his position. Whatever may be his technical responsibility to the Government, he must be supposed to speak their sentiments. So the world will judge. Whatever the *Journal of Commerce* may think of it—the people of this country will hold the Administration strictly accountable for the conduct of our consul at Paris. They give him his station; they give sanction and authority to his words. If he utters opinions upon public and political matters, and be continued in office, the world will justly infer that these opinions are acceptable to the Government. If they are not acceptable, and he still holds his place, then the Government will stand chargeable with occupying a false position—false to themselves and to the country.

Let us take another view of the matter. Whoever has looked over Mr. WALSH's letters in the *Living Age*, has seen that he has denounced in very offensive and flippant terms almost every member of the French government—the assembly—the ministry and the President of the republic. The latter he charges, by very plain insinuation, with having obtained his place by bribery and corruption. Is not this action? Is it not action for which Mr. WALSH is responsible to our government?

To bring the matter home, let us suppose that France or England kept a consul here, who was filling the papers there with denunciations of our institutions, our people, and our public men; suppose that his language passed the bounds of ordinary decency, and became revolting from its rabid virulence—what would be the effect? Should we not feel vexed and irritated? Would not such writings tend to embroil our country with that of the offender? Would not our government be called upon by public sentiment, if not from a regard for their own self-respect, to ask the recall of such an officer?

And why should not the French nation feel thus irritated towards us—especially as the impertinent and malignant gossip of our consul has been indulged at a moment of agitation, when, of necessity, every nerve is keenly sensitive to the slightest touch? The public need not be informed by what the French have, of late, manifested a restive feeling towards the United States; and, if we judge aright, a slight mistake now might bring about the most serious consequences. It is not at all impossible that Mr. WALSH's imprudence has been the cause of serious mischief already. Certainly, it would, in our opinion, be contrary to every dictate of freedom to maintain him in a position to involve the Government in further responsibility for his actions.

But there are even more serious grounds of objection to Mr. WALSH than these. We do not allude to the unsatisfactory manner in which he discharges the technical duties of his office—of which there is abundant proof at hand, and which furnish sufficient ground for his recall. This is a trifle, compared with the sentiments plainly set forth in his very last letter in the *Journal of Commerce*. We cannot better state the case than by quoting the following article from the New York Tribune of Friday last:

CONSEL WALSH INVOKING THE COERCION TO CRUSH FREEDOM.

The last letter of Robert Walsh, our consul at Paris, to the *Journal of Commerce*, says:

"There is an affinity between the present phases of this continent, and that of the first years of the old French revolution, which, in my view, renders applicable the language of the English statesman, in his masterly epistle to the Emperor of Russia, dated in 1791:

"Machina, your glory will be complete, if, after having given peace to Europe by your moderation, you shall bestow stability on all the governments by your vigor and decision. The debt which your imperial majesty's august presence has contracted to the ancient manners of Europe, by means which they civilized a vast empire, will be nobly repaid by preserving those manners from the hideous change with which they are now menaced. By the intervention of Russia the world will be preserved from barbarism and ruin."

"Some of your readers may be startled, and even indignant, at this my addition—that the repression of anarchy, the restoration and rescue of political order—the safety of civilization itself—may yet be the work of Russia. Distrust is banished from my mind, by the character, the declarations, and the very obvious interests of Czar Nicholas. Respectfully, we believe that we have to be the truth in the best language which can be rendered to our dignity in the sovereign people, or any other sovereign, or at any law."

But this does not satisfy our consular monarchist. Louis Napoleon, gilded by his six hundred thousand bayonets, feels unsafe while the press is allowed some faint shadow of liberty, and his American convenience calls for further repression! Hear him:

"Martial law being withdrawn from Paris, several of the suppressed journals, *La Reforme* at the head, have reappeared. The *National* and *La Presse*, which were spared, but obliged to curb their ardent propensities, are now giving loose to them in the most rancorous and vindictive spirit. *Extremely rigorous and reaching at the new code of the press may be deemed, it will be found ineffectual for its purpose.* This is manifest from the fresh experience of only a few days."

Was there ever a parallel for this language of any representative of America in Europe?

Here, then, is Mr. WALSH's political

creed. It is evidently written upon deliberation. He has heard the complaints made in this country against him, and he tells the sovereign people that he is in favor of Nicholas, the despot, the spoiler of Poland—the arch-enemy of liberty throughout the world. Nor is this all. Even the present restraints upon the press in France, stifling the voice of liberty and truth, do not satisfy him; he evidently wishes more stringent measures than these. After this, it seems to us that comment is a waste of words.

Seizure of the New Orleans and Sea-Gull.

The United States marshal of the eastern district of New York, says the *Journal of Commerce*, having made a requisition on Commodore McKee for a force to capture the vessels alleged to have been engaged in an illegal enterprise, Lieutenant Swartwout, of the line-of-battle ship North Carolina, in command of a party of United States marines and forty-two officers and seamen from the vessels in the harbor and the navy yard at Brooklyn, proceeded on Thursday evening in the steamboat Duncan C. Pell to the quarantine ground, where the Sea-Gull lay. This vessel was immediately taken possession of in the name of the United States, on a charge of violating the neutrality act. On board the Sea-Gull were about forty men, principally Spaniards and Cubans, it is said. The Sea-Gull was placed under the guns of the North Carolina, with a midshipman and a party of seamen on board.

The marshal, with the marines, then proceeded to seize the New Orleans at the foot of Cherry street, which was immediately occupied, and the New York Courier says on board of her were found 120,000 rations. The New Orleans previously belonged to the United States, but was sold some time since to a person named Woon, from whom she was obtained by the agents of the illicit expedition. During the investigation, the names of persons concerned were ascertained by the marshal, who, having communicated by telegraph with the Secretary of State, was ordered to arrest not only the vessels, but the persons, five of whom, the *Evening Post* states, named EDWARD WIER, MARION, PIOT, CLARK, and McFALL, were arrested. One of them was bailed on Friday for \$5,000.

The 6th section of the act passed in 1818 reads thus:

"And be it further enacted, That if any person shall, within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, begin, or set on foot, or prepare the means for any military expedition or enterprise, to be made by him, or by any other person, or by any foreign prince or state, or of any colony, district or people, with whom the United States are at peace, every person so offending, shall be deemed to be a high misdemeanor, and shall be fined not exceeding \$3,000, and imprisoned not more than three years."

There can be no doubt that, under the circumstances, the authorities had no alternative, and for their promptness and energy are entitled to praise.

The Philadelphia Ledger of Friday has the following statements relating to the same affair:

"One of the 'returned volunteers,' taken from this city, has given us the following history of the expedition, as he conceived it, as far as he knows, the persons engaged in it keeping remarkably close guard over their tongues. The person charged with the expedition, was a man in this city, who, with six others, was recruited last week for the expedition, being promised \$1,000 at the end of the affair, and plenty of plunder while engaged in it. He was sent to New York on Friday last, from the late-mentioned fact, that it was a perfectly honorable project, and that its purpose should be disclosed before he left the country."

"He went to New York on Friday last, with the other recruits, and was furnished quarters at the American Hotel, where there were about one hundred Spaniards. On Monday night they were taken to the depot at quarantine, where the Sea-Gull was being placed on board the propeller schooner Sea-Gull, which had started for her destination. They were under the command of an Englishman named Maguire. After going forty miles to sea, and finding nothing of the propeller, the captain refused to go further, and put back. The Sea-Gull was then taken to the depot at quarantine, where the men put on board, and the vessel loaded with boxes of muskets, and other articles, and the men were ordered to hand boxes of pistols and swords from the depot to the vessel."

"The revenue cutter visited the vessel, but could discover nothing. The recruits became dissatisfied with the mystery maintained, and, having misgivings of the object of the expedition, demanded to be put ashore. This demand was refused till they declared that they would leave the revenue cutter and appropriate the character of the proceeding. This had the effect of the men were set ashore, and their passages paid to Philadelphia. This is all our informant knows of the matter, but he has no doubt that some marauding expedition is intended."

The ramifications of this expedition appear most extensive, connecting certainly New York, Philadelphia, and New Orleans, and probably Boston and some of the western cities. The parties concerned will have reason to thank the Government for its interference, there is no doubt; it being incontestable that, if the expedition had sailed and landed at any point of the island of Cuba, it would have been met by an overwhelming Spanish force; for the captain general was familiar with all the plan, and few or none would have escaped massacre or the garrote.

The Hon. R. P. LETCHER, of Kentucky, Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Republic of Mexico, arrived in this city on the 8th instant, and has taken rooms at Willard's hotel, where he will remain for some days.

The Steam-ship Princeton.

A paragraph has been extensively circulated, the purport of which is, that after a survey of the hull of the United States steam-frigate Princeton, it had been determined to rebuild her, at an expense of sixty-eight thousand dollars. This, however, is not the case. A survey was held, and the report was, that the above sum would be required to put her into complete order. This report was not approved, and a second examination was ordered, which was made during the week ending with the eighth instant, at the Charleston navy yard. This fine frigate has done immense service in the gulf, and on her late cruise in the Mediterranean, and it is to be hoped that she will be found worthy of repair, and at a less amount than the first estimated cost.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

AN AMERICAN IN RUSSIA.—The *Harrisburg Union* states that Mr. J. M. Beck, well known in that place as an intelligent member of the geographical profession, translator, engraver, and universal genius, at the latest address, was confined in the fortress of Rastatt, in Germany. After visiting his friends, Mr. Beck was about returning to this country, when the revolution in France broke out. The excitement in Germany immediately followed, and he remained, and has since taken an active part in the struggle for liberty now in progress throughout Europe. They have agreed to release him upon condition that he will leave for the United States never to return.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.

THE FANNY KEMBLE BUTLER CASE.—A rule to show cause why a divorce should not be granted has been taken in this case, says the Philadelphia Ledger. It is understood that the respondent will make no opposition, in consequence of an arrangement by virtue of which \$1,500 per annum is to be paid to her, and a promise made that her children should be permitted to pass a portion of each year with her.